## REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-14, and 16-20 were pending when last examined.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salesky et al. (U.S.P.N. 6,343,313) and Kamada (U.S.P.N. 6,381,637). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent Claim 1 recites, in pertinent part, "A computer system for distributed collaborative computing, the system comprising...a computer program executable by the server computers, wherein the computer program comprises computer instructions for... assigning a respective unique identifier to each page of a document stored on one of the client computers for viewing on an arbitrary number of other client computers; and transmitting at least a portion of the respective unique identifiers for the pages of the document to each of the arbitrary number of other client computers so that the same pages can be viewed at each of the arbitrary number of other client computers." Salesky et al. and Kamada, taken separately or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest such a system.

The Examiner admits that, "Salesky differs from the claims in that Salesky does not teach the assigning a respective unique identifier to each page of a document stored on one of the client computers for viewing on an arbitrary number of other client computers." According to the Examiner, "However, this feature is known in the art as taught by Kamada. Kamada teaches a system having Internet automatic Web browsing function which comprises the assigning a respective unique identifier (URL address) to a page (col. 1, lines 44-46)." The Examiner then states, "It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Salesky and Kamada before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system taught by Salesky to include the assigning a respective unique

identifier to a page taught by Kamada with the motivation being to enable the system to quickly and easily identify the page."

Applicants respectfully disagree. The teachings of Salesky et al. and Kamada cannot be combined as proposed by the Examiner. In the passage cited by the Examiner, Kamada discloses *web* pages. See col. 1, lns. 44-46 ("A particular page (home page) on the WWW is assigned an address called a URL (Uniform Resource Locator) which is a unique address on the Internet."). One of ordinary skill in the art understands that a web page is set up in advance of its retrieval. The system of Salesky et al. works with screen shots. col. 7, lns. 35-40. ("During a conferencing session, presenter client 12 takes periodic 'snap-shots' of the application screen image contained within a rectangular boundary determined by the presenter, breaks the screen shot into smaller rectangular blocks, compares these blocks to information from a previous screen shot.") A screen shot is simply an image of what is displayed on a computer screen at a particular instance and, in contrast to web pages, cannot be known in advance. As such, it would nonsensical to use the URLs taught by Kamada to identify the screen shots of Salesky et al.

Furthermore, even assuming *arguendo* that Salesky et al. and Kamada could be combined, the resulting combination would not be the Applicant's claimed invention. Neither the system of the Salesky et al. or the system of Kamada handles or works with the pages of a *document*. Kamada discloses *web* pages, which are not the same as the pages of a document. Salesky et al. operates on screen shots, which are merely images. As such, the combination of Salesky et al. and Kamada still does not teach or disclose "assigning a respective unique identifier to each page of a document stored on one of the client computers for viewing on an arbitrary number of other client computers; and transmitting at least a portion of the respective unique identifiers for the pages of the document to each of the arbitrary number of other client computers so that the same pages can be viewed at each of the arbitrary number of other client computers," as recited in Claim 1.

As such, Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Likewise, Applicant's Claim 7, recites in pertinent part, "A method of operating a distributed collaborative computing system comprising a plurality of server computers, the method comprising: ... assigning a respective unique identifier to each page of a document stored on one of the client computers for viewing on an arbitrary number of other client computers; and transmitting at least a portion of the respective unique identifiers for the pages of the document to each of the arbitrary number of other client computers so that the same pages can be viewed at each of the arbitrary number of other client computers." Applicant's Claim 13, recites in pertinent part, "A computer-readable storage medium storing a computer program executable by a plurality of server computers, the computer program comprising computer instructions for: ... assigning a respective unique identifier to each page of a document stored on one of the client computers for viewing on an arbitrary number of other client computers; and transmitting at least a portion of the respective unique identifiers for the pages of the document to each of the arbitrary number of other client computers so that the same pages can be viewed at each of the arbitrary number of other client computers." Claims 7 and 13 are patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 7, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and to allow these claims. Each of Claims 2-5, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16, and 17 depends from one of Claims 1, 7, and 13 and includes further limitations. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims -5, 8, 10, 11, 14, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn and these claims be allowed.

Claims 6, 12, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salesky et al., Kamada, and Larson et al. (U.S.P.N. 5,907,324). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 6, 12, and 18 depend from Claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, and thus by virtue of this dependency include limitations not disclosed or taught by Salesky et al. and Kamada, as discussed above. Furthermore, such limitations are not taught or suggested by

Larson et al., either taken alone or in combination with Salesky et al. and Kamada. As such, the cited references do not render obvious Applicants' Claims 6, 12, and 18.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claims 6, 12, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and to allow these claims.

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salesky, Kamada, and May et al. (U.S.P.N. 6,574,674).

Claims 19 and 20 depend from Claim 1, and thus by virtue of this dependency include limitations not disclosed or taught by Salesky et al. and Kamada, as discussed above. Furthermore, such limitations are not taught or suggested by May et al., either taken alone or in combination with Salesky et al. and Kamada. As such, the cited references do not render obvious Applicants' Claims 19 and 20.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and to allow these claims.

# CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-1200.

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.:
**EV 305 258 585 US**

Respectfully submitted,

By:

_____
Philip W. Woo
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 39,880
PWW/rp

May 6, 2004

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
555 California Street, Suite 5000
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715
(415) 772-7200